



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/520,402	03/08/2000	Mark L Yoseloff	PA0437.ap.US	1303

7590 07/29/2003

MARK A. LITMAN
MARK A. LITMAN & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
3209 WEST 76TH STREET
SUITE 205
EDINA, MN 55435

EXAMINER

MENDIRATTA, VISHU K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3711

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 25

Application Number: 09/520,402

Filing Date: March 08, 2000

Appellant(s): YOSELOFF, MARK L

MAILED

JUL 29 2003

GROUP 3700

YOSELOFF, MARK L
For Appellant

SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 03/11/03.

(1) *Real Party in Interest*

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences*

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) *Status of Claims*

- 1) Claims 1-19 and 22-37 have been finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Williams ('311) in view of Ornstein ('885).
- 2) Claims 20-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Netley in view of Ornstein ('885).

(4) *Status of Amendments After Final*

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) *Summary of Invention*

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) *Issues*

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) *Grouping of Claims*

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1-37 stand or fall together on pages 9-11.

(8) *ClaimsAppealed*

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) *Prior Art of Record*

6,132,311	Williams	08-2000
5,570,885	Ornstein	11-1996
5,868,618	Netley et al.	02-1999
6,179,711	Yoseloff	01-2001

(10) *Grounds of Rejection*

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

In order to determine whether application claims must be found unpatentable over the prior art, the terms and phrases used in the claims must be read in light of the specification. This is necessary to establish whether the meaning of those terms and phrases given by the applicant in the context of the application should be accorded any meaning different from the usual and customary meaning of the claim terms. Here, it is submitted that most of the claim terms, such as "symbols" and "bet", must be given their intrinsic dictionary definition. But some other terms such as "rank" and "payout table" require some scrutiny. A careful review of the specification as filed and especially page 23, lines 1-12, makes it clear that applicant intends a specific payout for a specific rank hand on the table.

Claims 1-19, 22-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams (6,132,311) in view of Ornstein (5,570,885).

Williams teaches a method of playing a wagering game with at least at least two plays (abstract line 1), receiving at least one set of symbols (32,36,40), receiving a second set of symbols (32,36,50), comparing each set to symbols to the payout table (20), determining the ranks of first and second set of symbols whether they exceed a minimum rank ("two pair" in table 20).

Resolving the wager with respect to first and second set of symbols (col.7, lines 5-10). Ornstein further teaches deck of playing cards (col.11, lines 21-22), poker ranks (20).

Williams teaches all limitations of these claims except that it does not teach resolving a bet with respect when both first and second set of symbols exceed a minimum rank in the pay table.

Ornstein teaches a method of playing a game where a payoff is made for consecutive winnings (col.2, lines 17-21) and enhanced payoff due to consecutive winnings (col.3, lines 42-47). If a player knows that he would make additional money by winning two or more hands consecutively, he would be more interested in playing that game.

Applicant might argue that hands 40 and 50 are not consecutive hands.

One of ordinary skill in art at the time the invention was made would have made the game more attractive for players by making an additional payoff for winning two or more plays consecutively. Examiner takes the position that while practicing the game on a gaming table the turning of cards 40 and 50 would be consecutive (col.11, lines 1-8).

Examiner views applicant's variations in pay tables, minimum ranks and number of bets required for hands are choices of game houses and would change according to their financial situations.

In order to make the game house profitable, it would have been obvious to change such limitations without changing the scope and spirit of the game.

Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Netley (5,868,618) in view of Ornstein (5,570,885).

Netley teaches a method of playing a poker game comprising the steps of wagering for each game (col.3, lines 13-14), playing at least two games (abstract), allowed to play a second game if winning the first game (col.2, lines 65-67), awards for winning both hands (col.3, lines 27-31), and bonus (col.3, lines 39).

Netley teaches all limitations of these claims except that it does not teach resolving a bet with respect when both first and second set of symbols exceed a minimum rank in the pay table.

Ornstein teaches a method of playing a game where a payoff is made for consecutive winnings (col.2, lines 17-21) and enhanced payoff due to consecutive winnings (col.3, lines 42-47. If a player knows that he would make additional money by winning two or more hands consecutively, he would be more interested in playing that game.

Applicant might argue that hands 40 and 50 are not consecutive hands.

One of ordinary skill in art at the time the invention was made would have made the game more attractive for players by making an additional payoff for winning two or more plays consecutively. If a player knows that he would make additional money by winning two or more hands consecutively, he would be more interested in playing that game.

(11) Response to Argument

In page 12, lines 2-3 the applicant alleges that the double patenting rejection does not specify over which claims the prior art 6,471,208 (?) in view of Ornstein. Examiner has clearly indicated in page 4 of office action mailed on 11/4/02 that claims are rejected over claim 1 of Patent 6,179,711 in view of Ornstein.

Applicant has also erroneously referred to Patent 6,471,208 as opposed to the cited Patent 6,179,711 that is in the rejection.

In page 12, lines 6-8 the applicant has offered to provide a Terminal disclaimer, however until then it does not obviate the double patenting rejection.

In page 12, line 10 through page 15, line 13 the applicant argument that the double patenting of claims 1,4,15,20,23 and 31 is in error is not persuasive.

Firstly the applicant is basing the arguments erroneously referring to patent 6,471,208. This patent is not a cited reference. The cited reference is Patent 6,179,711.

Secondly the applicant's arguments are not understood in highlighting limitations in patent claims that are not present in the in the play or in applicant's claims and I providing reasons why they are not present in applicant's claims. The real question is "are there any limitations in applicant's claims that are not present in patent claims that would be considered patentable?"

Applicant's argument in page 16, line18-21 that Williams in view of Ornstein does not teach playing a second game without placing a second wager is not persuasive. Williams clearly teaches (see Williams abstract lines 1-3) player making a wager to play two or more hands.

With regards to applicant's arguments in page 17, lines 9-10 that the secondary reference Ornstein does not relate to ranks. Examiner takes the position that the rejection does not rely on whether the secondary reference relates or does not relate to ranking system, but whether it supplements or not what the primary reference lacks. The primary reference only lacks payouts for winning consecutive hands regardless of the use of such a method being used for playing poker, blackjack or a dice game. In the rejection the difference is in the limitation of winning

enhanced payout for winning consecutive hands. Ornstein clearly teaches winning enhanced payout for winning consecutive hands (see Ornstein 3:42-47).

With regards to arguments regarding claims 3, Williams clearly teaches wining with minimum ranks (20).

With regards to arguments regarding claims 4-11, intended use of a method step having a symbol is same as cards because cards have symbols too.

With regards to claims 15,16 playing video games is intended use of the method and does not change the method in essence.

With regards to claims 17, 18: Ornstein clearly teaches enhanced payout for two or more consecutive winnings.

With regards to claim 19: Williams teaches payable (20)

With regards to claims 22-25,28-37: see rejection of claim 1, 22 and 23.

With regards to claim 26: Playing slot game is only an intended use of the method in essence.


With regards to claim 27: Ornstein teaches an embodiment where player's hand is compared with dealer's hand for playing blackjack (3:42-47).

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

NOTE: Examiner contacted attorney Marc Litman on 7/24/03 with regards to claim 21 that was inadvertently omitted from final rejection. The attorney agreed to include claim 21 as finally rejected claim. The current status of claims stands corrected.

The applicant submitted a terminal disclaimer on 6/6/03. The terminal disclaimer is proper and has been recorded. In view of the above submitted terminal disclaimer the obviousness type double patenting rejection of claims 1,4,15,20,23 and 31 is obviated. The current status of claims stands corrected.

Respectfully submitted,




Ben Layno

Primary Examiner

VKM
July 24, 2003

Conferees
Paul Sewell SPE

Vishu Mendiratta Examiner.....


Sebastian Passaniti
Primary Examiner, Acting SPE
For Paul Sewell.

MARK A. LITMAN
MARK A. LITMAN & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
3209 WEST 76TH STREET
SUITE 205
EDINA, MN 55435